DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 345 350 EA 023 937

AUTHOR Johannesson, Ingolfur Asgeir
TITLE Principles of Legitimation in Educational Discourses in Iceland.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Historical Materials (060)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Foreign Countries; *Research Methodology; *School Restructuring; Teacher Education; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Iceland

ABSTRACT

This paper interrelates the conceptual approaches of Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu to draw a method to investigate reform in elementary education (ages 6-16) in Iceland in the past 25 years. First is a brief explanation of the conceptual framework of the research that has been conducted on the reform. Identified are three main spectra of legitimating principles in the discourse on educational reform and teacher education in Iceland. These spectra are: a reform versus pre-reform spectrum; a reform spectrum with technological and progressive poles; and a traditional academic capital versus curriculum theory capital spectrum. The last section of the paper discusses the prospects of this research approach compared to other approaches to the study of educational reform. It is argued that most conventional educational research is too preoccupied with producing progress to enable researchers to take a self-critical stance about the underlying assumptions. A framework that can deal with discourses, structural relations, and individuals in one study provides researchers and practitioners in the field with the potential of being reflective on their involvement without blaming themselves for failing reforms. (41 references) (RR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED345350

Ingólfur Ásgeir Jóhannesson
home-address:
Fiskakvísl 13, IS-110 REYKJAVÍK, Iceland
work-address:
Umferdarrád, Borgartúni 33, IS-150 REYKJAVÍK, Iceland
ph. 354-1-676603 (home), 354-1-622000 (work), 354-1-627500 (fax)
e-mail address: ingo@kopasker.is

Principles of Legitimation in Educational Discourses in Iceland

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
I. A. Johannesson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presentation at the American Educational Research Association conference, Division B, San Francisco, April 20-24, 1992 in a symposium entitled
Curriculum History in Settlings of New Historiographic and Conceptual Problems

EA 023 937

Draft - not for citation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This presentation interrelates the conceptual approaches of Michel Foucault and Pierre Bourdieu to draw a method to investigate reform in elementary education (age level 6-16) in Iceland in the last 25 years. The reform, first initiated by a government institution, Skólarannsóknadeild (Department of Educational Research and Development within the Ministry of Culture and Education), in Iceland in the late 1960s and early 1970s, included major revisions of the curriculum in all subject matters. The reform was put forward to modernize education in the Icelandic society and was based on post-World War II developments in curriculum theory and educational psychology in the United States and Western Europe. Now, at the beginning of the 1990s, almost a decade after the termination of Skólarannsóknadeild in 1984, teacher education institutions appear as the primary sites to investigate the impact of the reform ideas on the discourse on education.

The paper unfolds as follows. First I explain briefly the conceptual framework of the research that I have been conducting on the reform. Then I identify the three main spectra of legitimating principles in the discourse on educational reform and teacher education in Iceland. I focus on the tensions over what counts as capital in teacher education. In short, pedagogy, curriculum theory, educational psychology, and other educational sciences signify a discursive pole that is gaining currency on the cost of the capital of the traditional academic disciplines, such as Icelandic, history, and biology, which signify the other pole in this spectrum. In the last section, I discuss the prospects of this research approach compared with other approaches to the study of educational reform. I argue that most conventional educational research is too preoccupied with producing progress to enable researchers to take a self-critical stance about the underlying assumptions. A framework that can deal with discourses, structural relations, and individuals in one study provides researchers and practitioners in the field with the potential of being reflective on their involvement without throwing a blame on themselves for failing reforms.

I. The Conceptual framework: An introduction

In this section, I discuss briefly the concepts of genealogical history, discursive themes, social fields, cultural as well as symbolic capital, and legitimating principles. (For a more detailed discussion, see, e.g., Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1991a, chapter 2.1.)

GENEALOGICAL HISTORY AND DISCURSIVE THEMES

To investigate the historical conjuncture of discourses and pedagogical practices in contemporary Icelandic society, I use a genealogical analysis similar to that of French historian of systems of thought Michel Foucault (e.g., 1971, 1972, 1977, 1980; see also Noujain 1987, Luke 1989). Genealogy is a historical analysis that traces how discursive elements break up and

reconnect to form new discursive elements and beliefs, in contrast with searching for causal relationships and the essential nature of ideas. Genealogy searches for continuities and discontinuities, ruptures and breaks in discourses and social practices, and it examines the relationship between these continuities and discontinuities. In this view, there is no ultimate "essence" of ideas or practices or a fundamental source that they can be traced to; rather, I trace the trajectory [1)] of an idea or a practice through an array of earlier conjunctures. The main strength of this approach is that it enables to see how the significance of these elements of discourses, which I call discursive themes, and social practices emerged in a particular place and time.

A genealogical analysis differs from those approaches to the study of history that search for causal relationships or trace the chronology of events. The difference between genealogical history and "conventional" history or "critical [theory] ... enterprise is not one of object or field, but point of attack, perspective and delimitation" (Foucault 1971, 26). "It is thus that critical and genealogical descriptions are to alternate, support and complete each other" (Foucault 1971, 27). The genealogical study that I have been conducting on the Icelandic reform alternates, supports, and completes critical analysis, such as the epistemological analysis of the Icelandic social studies curriculum project investigated by Thorsteinn Gunnarsson in a recent doctoral dissertation (1990).

Therefore, I have investigated the reform in elementary education as a conjuncture wherein the discourse of Skólarannsóknadeild and simultaneous innovations in Icelandic elementary education, such as open schools, meet other discourses and practices in society. Here I focus on the impact of this discourse on what counts as capital in teacher education now at the beginning of the 1990s. The focus on the conjuncture deals with the reform discourse in terms of its connections with other discourses and ruptures in structural relations followed by its introduction, in contrast with a chronology of reform events. This focus enables to account for the complexities and nuances of the reform, in contrast with listing causes for how the reform was carried through or not carried through. This focus directs attention to the specificities of the reform conjuncture, in contrast with relating the reform to universal explanations of modernity or the evolution of societies.

SOCIAL FIELDS AND LEGITIMATING PRINCIPLES

I have borrowed and adapted a conceptual framework, attributed to the French sociologist and anthropologist Pierre Bourdieu (e.g., 1975, 1984, 1985, 1986a, 1988, 1989a, 1989b, 1989c, 1990), to interpret what I call "the social field of educational reform in Iceland." Social field, in Bourdieu's relational, structural definition, refers to the way of representing the "social world" as a space (1985, 723). Bourdieu argues that a social space is "a multi-dimensional space of positions" (1985, 724). He explains:

> The position of a given agent within the social space can ... be defined by the positions [s/]he occupies in the different fields, that is, in the distribution of the powers that are active within each of them. These are, principally, economic capital (in its different kinds), cultural capital and social capital as well as symbolic capital, commonly called prestige, reputation, renown, etc., which is the form in which the different forms [economic, cultural, social] of capital are perceived and recognized as legitimate (1985, 724; see also Bourdieu 1986a).

Bourdieu focuses on the site of the struggle as the key to understand the structural relations which result in the production of different versions of capital. The site of struggle is the social field and what is struggled over is the legitimacy of ideas (i.e., discursive themes) and practices. Thus, in this view, a given social field is a particular set of relations; it is a space of relationships. The possibilities for connections in social space, within or crossing over arbitrarily drawn lines, are endless. However, relationships are never entirely accidental; connections are more likely to happen, and networks to be established, when individuals and groups are close to each other in a given social space. "To speak of a social space means that one cannot group just **anyone** with **anyone** while ignoring the fundamental differences, particularly economic and cultural ones" (Bourdieu 1985, 726). Yet, "alliance between those who are closest is never **necessary**, inevitable (because the effects of immediate competition may act as screen), and alliance between those most distant from each other is never **impossible**" (Bourdieu 1985, 726). It is in the willingness to accept the possibility of investigating any kind of social connections that Bourdieu departs from most economist Marxists who traditionally have looked for connections on the ground of how individuals, fractions, and classes relate to the means of production.

To identify the relations and connections in a given field is more important than to define boundaries. A field is a network of empirical connections in the social space and "[t]he limits of the field are situated at the point where the effects of the field cease" (Bourdieu 1989b, 39). These limits are specific to each field and can not be fixed once and for all. Because this definition draws attention to the processes (trajectories) of legitimation that shape the given field's history, it differs substantially from definitions that focus on identifying boundaries between social groups, often on the ground of rules derived from studies of entirely different fields. In contrast, a social field *a la* Bourdieu is structured around spectra of historically and socially constructed legitimating principles that are the available means (social strategies [2)]) for individuals to make sense of the reform and, in fact, to capitalize on. Discursive themes fall into patterns around these principles that are specific to the field. In studying these patterns by a genealogical investigation, I teased out the significance of the points of intersections by asking specific questions about the structured and

structuring processes (i.e., legitimating principles) in the field of educational reform which constantly restructure what counts as symbolic capital which, in turn, restructures the legitimating principles.

II. The principles of legitimation: Three field-specific spectra

The research that the presentation is based on suggests that there are three major spectra of legitimating principles that compete in the field of reform. These spectra are a reform versus pre-reform spectrum, a reform spectrum with technological and progressive poles, and a traditional academic capital versus curriculum theory capital spectrum.

THE REFORM VERSUS THE PRE-REFORM PRINCIPLE

Skólarannsóknadeild launched curriculum revision projects in subject matters, such as physics and chemistry, biology, mathematics, Icelandic, Christian studies, Danish, English, social studies, the art and crafts, and physical education. [3] In the reform discourse is visible a pattern of scientist arguments for democratic and child-centered concerns. There is a belief in progressive education; in particular, open schools were celebrated as a prototype of the most proper reform practice. There is a belief in scientist curriculum models, such as the Bloom taxonomy and the Taba curriculum spiral, and developmental psychology *a la* Piaget and Kohlberg. And there is a belief in activity pedagogy. Other themes include the beliefs that knowledge is process, that the learner is active, that evaluation needs to be continuous, and that subject matters need to be integrated. Common "catch terms" are, for instance, activity, inquiry, hands-on, integration, and mixed ability grouping. [4]

Reformers presented these discursive themes in opposition with the pre-reform pedagogy. They depicted the pre-reform pedagogy as non-democratic and pre-scientific. They pointed out that students were usually expected to be inactive and that knowledge was treated as fixed. They also directed attention to the arbitrariness of written tests, a widespread practice in the Icelandic school system since the 1920s. In short, the reformers depicted the pre-reform pedagogy as plagued by uncritical transmission of outdated facts. Researcher Thorsteinn Gunnarsson has come to a similar conclusion. He describes a tradition inherited from the church that is prevalent in schools; that is, "the model of the teacher as minister, the textbooks as scriptures and the students as the passive congregation" (1990, 268).

Although the differences between the reform and pre-reform traditions certainly are in part based on epistemological grounds, they are also discursive differences that had to be created so that they would count as capital. For instance, it does not matter whether the pre-reform pedagogy was in fact plagued by uncritical transmission of outdated facts; what matters is the ability of the reformers to present, for instance, inquiry

learning and hands-on pedagogy as different from and better than (that is, more democratic, more scientific) the pre-reform pedagogy. What matters is the ability to challenge the old hierarchy of values and convert the reform into a new legitimating principle, different from the principle that the pre-reform pedagogical tradition was based on. In brief, reformers were capable of structuring a social field of educational reform which is based on a sense of logic different from that of the larger field of education and different from the logic of other intellectal fields.

THE TECHNOLOGICAL POLE VERSUS THE PROGRESSIVE POLE

The second spectrum in the reform discourse is represented in a tension between scientist perspectives, on the one hand, and democratic and child-centered perspectives, on the other. The first pole I label the technological pole; the latter pole I label the progressive pole. This tension is a rising tension that has been kept under the rug for most of the last 25 years. In short, there has been an alliance between proponents of technological and progressive views. One of the reasons for how long time this alliance has lasted is the attacks on the social studies curriculum in the mid-1980s which led proponents of progressive views to highlight scientist arguments for democratic, child-centered concerns and to promote teacher professionalism (Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1991a, chapter 7.2; 1992k; see also Thorsteinn Gunnarsson 1990). But as "progressivists" start questioning the epistemological, historical, and political foundations of developmental psychology and other scientist theories, we may see this alliance collapse (Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1991a, chapter 8.2). (For a further discussion on the two above spectra, see Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1991a, chapters 3.1 and 5.2; see also 1991b, 1991c, 1992a, 1992d.)

IS CURRICULUM THEORY CAPITAL BECOMING THE MAJOR SOURCE OF LEGITIMACY IN TEACHER EDUCATION?

The major principles of legitimation that compete in teacher education are a principle based on academic conventions, influential in disciplines such as Icelandic language and literature, history, theology, biology, and chemistry, and a principle based on notions emerging from pedagogy, curriculum theory, educational psychology, and other educational sciences. This spectrum appears to structure the debates within the area of teacher education. As an area, teacher education could well be defined as a special social field but because of connections between the College of Education (hereafter I use the Icelandic abbreviation for Kennaraháskóli Íslands, KHÍ) and the late Skólarannsóknadeild (most important, almost one third of the faculty of KHÍ was involved in the work of Skólarannsóknadeild), I find it more fruitful to interpret debates in teacher education as part of the discourse in the social field of educational reform. Teacher education institutions such as the KHÍ are among the primary sites where debates concerning educational reform take place, and it is the increased visibility of debates on teacher education that direct my attention as a researcher of

educational reform to teacher education institutions.

As I have argued elsewhere, curriculum theory capital is an unusually ambiguous notion. But because the field of educational reform is not bound by the conventions of other academic fields or the state bureaucracy field, the ambiguity is an advantage for those who make the effort to capitalize on the discursive themes of the reform, such as integration, child-centered perspectives, process evaluation, or developmental psychology (Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1992k). An emerging type of capital is less easy to define than a more established notion of capital; yet a few lines of what constitutes curriculum theory capital can be drawn. First it rests in the notions of democracy and child-centeredness and on the view that prospective teachers should emphasize to study pedagogy and curriculum theory, as opposed to psychology or traditional academic disciplines. Curriculum theory capital also rests in the notion that curriculum theory needs the academic credibility that many reformers, in particular those with little social capital (reformers with secondary education obtained in the least elitist secondary education institutions in the country, individuals from rural Iceland, etc.), have sought by education in educational theory overseas. Further, curriculum theory capital rests in the notion that a domestic curriculum theory production is taking place, in particular in the work of the social studies team (Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1991a, chapters 4.1 and 5.1). Lastly, but perhaps most important in respect to struggles in the field of reform, curriculum theory capital rests in the notion that teacher education is qualitatively different from most other education on a university level; for instance, it is often pointed out that teacher education is at the same time an academic education and a preparation for a certain job (see Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1992c).

The emerging curriculum theory capital pole is represented by people with degrees in educational theory -- pedagogy, curriculum theory, educational psychology, etc. -- who increasingly assert the claim that teacher education should be developed by seeking the primary legitimation in the wisdom that these studies have for school work but less in the academic conventions. For instance, Ólafur J. Proppé, Sigurjón Mýrdal and Bjarni Daníelsson (in progress) argue that such theories are invaluable in their own right and that teacher education should not be structured around traditional academic disciplines. Furthermore, in a presentation at a conference on teacher education in April 1986, it is argued, on the behalf of the KHÍ, that

> it is a doubtful case if the KHÍ should seek prototypes to the University of Iceland or other general universities concerning content and methods. It seems to be more important for the Icelandic community that the KHÍ faculty -- in order to create an independent educational policy and foster the distinctiveness of the institution [i.e., the KHÍ] as an institution for scientific education and research -- exhibit ambitions in research, teaching, and other tasks related to educational issues (Kennaraháskóli Íslands 1986, 57).

It should also be noted that the language of the new curriculum for the KHÍ is a language characteristic for the reform discourse, and the organization of classes in this curriculum has the so-called "teacher studies" (kennarafrædi) as a starting point. For example, instruction in Icelandic and math in the core curriculum is now considered a part of teacher studies (**Námskrá fyrir almennt kennaranám** 1991, **Kennsluskrá fyrir almennt kennaranám** 1991). Nevertheless, the view in the above citation is not agreed upon by everyone among the KHÍ faculty (Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1992c).

Analysis of the writing of the KHÍ faculty also reveals what counts as capital in debates in the KHÍ. A preliminary investigation of a book written by four faculty members, entitled **Álitamál** (How to teach about matters of opinion) (Erla Kristjánsdóttir et al. 1989), suggests that the logic of teacher studies (i.e., curriculum theory capital) has an increasing impact on research in the KHÍ (Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1992c). The authors agreed to publish essays that deal with a classic curriculum theory question; that is, how to teach about matters of opinion. Furthermore, the introduction to the book is written by the curriculum theorist in the group (i.e., Erla Kristjánsdóttir). Nevertheless, the authors do not take a single position. The essay by the one of the authors who teaches Icelandic, Baldur Hafstad, is the essay that least deals with the problem through the eyes of curriculum theory, while the essay by Erla Kristjánsdóttir about social studies is the one that most deals with the problem from the perspective of curriculum theory. In fact, the subject matter Icelandic is taken for granted and does not need curriculum theory to legitimize its topics or methods. Meanwhile, social studies as a subject matter is a much closer relative to curriculum theory. The two remaining essays concern Christian studies, a mandatory subject in the schools of the Lutheran nation of Iceland, and biology, a young subject in Icelandic schools. The author of the Christian studies essay, Sigurdur Pálsson, formerly worked for Skólarannsóknadeild, and he uses developmental psychology and the history of schooling to strengthen the case for Christian studies. The last essay, on biology, written by Stefán Bergmann, relies on the literature in science education, that is, a particular strand of literature within the curriculum theory literature, to make his points. It shows the currency of curriculum theory capital that curriculum theory literature is supposed to be helpful to argue for the methods of a new subject matter.

HOW INDIVIDUALS IN TEACHER EDUCATION RELATE TO DISCURSIVE POLES

By investigating the education and career of teacher educators, it is possible to see the relationships between them as epistemic individuals and the discursive traditions within the field of reform. The notion of epistemic individuals is developed by Bourdieu in, for instance, **Homo Academicus** (1988; see also Bourdieu 1989d, 6-7). This notion is important in developing a reflective research framework as it directs attention away from individuals' intentions and helps objectifying the relations between

individuals, discursive themes, and institutions. The concept epistemic individuals refers to the way of seeing individual persons as occupying spaces in structural relations where they are defined in relation to each other and where they are shaping as well as shaped by the trajectory of events. Epistemic individuals, consciously and unconsciously, adopt curriculum views to create distinctions; for instance, they adopt science and democracy to contrast these notions with the allegedly non-democratic and pre-scientific pre-reform schooling in the country, and they adopt pedagogy, curriculum theory, and other educational science as capital as opposed to the capital of the traditional academic disciplines.

In my dissertation research, I focussed on the education, careers and, to some extent, family relations of the reformers. [5)] The assumption is that an exposure to certain themes -- that is, certain types of cultural capital -- shapes what I call "epistemic relations," relations that go beyond mere intentions of an individual or a group of individuals. In brief, the University of Iceland's Division of Pedagogy, which educates most secondary school teachers and many elementary school teachers, had 18 faculty members in the spring of 1990. Eleven of them were men and seven were female. Almost all of them had a studentsprof (gymnasium) examination, and about half of them from the old, elitist Reykjavík gymnasium (Menntaskólinn í Reykjavík). Nine of the faculty had a doctoral degree. Five of these degrees are in psychology and no one of the permanent faculty has a degree in pedagogy and curriculum theory. Eight of the doctoral degrees were acquired in English-speaking countries, that is, Great Britain, the United States, and Canada. Lastly, but with notable exceptions, the University faculty members have very little experience of the Skólarannsóknadeild work or of teaching in open schools or other progressive schools (Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1991a, 231-4).

In contrast, the KHÍ faculty has, as already noted, much more experience of the Skólarannsóknadeild work. Eighteen of the 60 people faculty in the spring of 1990 had worked for Skólarannsóknadeild as staff members, textbook writers, or advisors. Slightly more than half of the KHÍ faculty are women. Almost two thirds of the KHÍ faculty have studentsprof, and the largest group of those, at least 15 people, acquired the studentsprof in the Reykjavík gymnasium. It has been argued that the large number of studentsprof graduates among faculty members has severe implications for the KHÍ because "exactly in the gymnasia is the school system's strongest distaste for psychology and pedagogy" (Jónas Pálsson 1978, 8). More than one third of the faculty has teacher education in the Teacher School of Iceland (Kennaraskóli Íslands), the secondary school level predecessor of the KHÍ, as the base of the beyond-compulsory education. Eleven of those have acquired further education in pedagogy, curriculum theory, or other educational science. Of the studentsprof graduates, an equally many (eleven in each group) have acquired education in educational science and in a traditional academic discipline (including psychology). Quite a few (seven) have a degree in both educational science and in a traditional discipline

(often psychology). Nine of the faculty have doctoral degrees. These degrees were acquired in a number of European and North-American countries (Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1991a, 211-16).

The structure of epistemic relations in the KHÍ and in the University's Division of Pedagogy may explain the fact that curriculum theory capital has indeed not gained absolute legitimacy in the field of reform. Many teacher educators with degrees in traditional academic disciplines (such as Icelandic or Christian theology) believe that teacher education needs to rely more on solid education in those disciplines, "spiced" with a few discipline-specific pedagogy classes. In the University's Division of Pedagogy, the immense strength of psychology, which has a longer tradition as an academic discipline than curriculum theory, makes it more difficult to capitalize there on curriculum theory than seems to be the case in the KHÍ which -- as an institution -- is less bound by the conventional academic conventions. In fact, the Division of Pedagogy is squeezed between psychology and sociology in the Faculty of Social Sciences (Félagsvísindadeild), and it seems to me that it is easier to legitimize the latter two disciplines on the ground of the traditional academic disciplines' legitimating principle than it is to legitimize pedagogy and curriculum theory as it is common to view pedagogy and curriculum theory as a mere occupational training as opposed to an academic endeavor. Nonetheless, KHÍ faculty members with studentsprof or a degree in a traditional academic discipline are in many cases more interested in research in their discipline than in research in teacher education and consider themselves belong to the research community of that discipline. And while permanent faculty members of the KHÍ have, according to law, to finish a diploma in pedagogy and curriculum theory or have other sufficient preparation in educational theory, it appears that in most cases the KHÍ hires people largely on the ground of traditional academic qualifications (Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1991a, 212). Little experience of teaching in progressive schools is also a point on the negative side for the legitimation of curriculum theory capital as only a handfull of the 80 people faculty in these teacher education institutions can legitimize their work that way.

III. Implications for studies of educational reforms

The discussion in this section is aimed at the following three points. First I consider the impact of the modern idea of evolutionary progress on the beliefs of the reformers and on research in education. Second I discuss how using a conceptual research framework, suited to deal with individuals, discourses, and structural relations in one study, helps the researcher to avoid the creation of arbitrary boundaries and fixed taxonomies. I point out that looking for continuities and ruptures in the educational discourse may enable the redefinition of alliances and lead to new strategies for enhancing the value of certain capital. Lastly I discuss the question in which way my

research on educational reform in Iceland can be considered as guiding future research in curriculum history.

REFLECTING ON THE PREOCCUPATION WITH PRODUCING PROGRESS

The reformers' involvement in reform projects was based on a belief in historical progress as well as a belief in that that scientific knowledge and better schools can lead to a more just society. These beliefs are indeed central to modernity. Further, all reforms are based on the notion of rational progress. Thomas S. Popkewitz points out that

> the belief that the social and material world has evolutionary qualities that can be positively influenced through people's intervention is a recent historical development. The modern state, developmental views of individuality, conceptions of science as bringing a better world, and invention of planned reform are part of the cosmology of Western Europe and the United States (1991, 34-5)

In optimism and reliance on a rational epistemology, reformers tend to lose sight of the fact that the notions of progress, change, and evolution are historically and socially constructed. These notions are taken for granted.

The preoccupation with producing progress, in research and practice alike, often prevents reformers from taking a reflective stance on the foundations of the reform proposals. To view progress and change as natural often makes reformers try to find someone or something to blame when a reform is perceived failing. The tendency is to blame a group for failure or bad intentions (or celebrate for success or good intentions). Bourdieu's framework, on the other hand, helps the researcher and others to reflect on their involvement in the reform by objectifying the relations between individuals, including the researcher, and the types of capital that have currency in the field; that is, seeing the individuals in the social and political context. The issue seems to be that individuals, simultaneously with working on the advance of the proposals that they believe in, are able to call into question the epistemology of these proposals and their own beliefs. For instance, my awareness of the epistemological and historical bases of the social studies project is not a reason to shelf my convictions that subject integration, inquiry learning, or process evaluation are useful devices in preparing children for a democratic participation in society. But this awareness certainly distances my psychological self because it enables me to think more about how I think (for a discussion on the importance of finding ways to work within and yet challenge a legitimate discourse, see Lather 1991, e.g., 38-9).

By utilizing the relational and genealogical frameworks, the researcher is also in a better position to be critical of the assumption that research ought to give a direct, "utilitarian" guidance for intervention. These research approaches do not offer concrete suggestions about what to do. They are not meant to scientifically prove that pedagogy, curriculum theory, or other

educational sciences are better than the disciplines of Icelandic or biology to "produce" good elementary school teachers. Moreover, Bourdieu's relational framework and the Foucauldian genealogy reject the preoccupation with producing progress, central to most other research in education, and my study illuminates that there is no simple relationship between intentions and outcomes. For instance, it was not the intent of the Icelandic reformers to form a special social field of educational reform.

The fact that Bourdieuean analysis of changes in legitimation and Foucauldian analysis of disconnections and reconnections between discursive themes do not promise to find a better method to insure that a planned intervention will have its intended consequences is distressing for those who capitalize on using their scholarship to identify what "needs to be done." Allegations concerning Bourdieu's "pessimism" (e.g., Baron et al. 1981, 187) are more due to the taken-for-granted notion of rational progress than they are warranted by his conceptions, and to view the reform as a trajectory emphasizes how difficult it is foresee an "evolution" leading to a definate objective.

FIXED TAXONOMIES OR EPISTEMIC ALLIANCES?

By focusing on the relations between discursive themes and epistemic individuals, as opposed to attempting to find the essential nature of the reform proposals and other traditions, I avoid creating arbitrary boundaries concerning what can become capital or where. By "creating arbitrary boundaries," I am referring to the fact that many current research approaches arbitrarily divide people into groups and define ideas as essential entities by using universal categories. Typically these divisions are dualistic and antagonistic. In contrast, the frameworks that I have adopted assume that differences are constructed and that what counts as capital is field-specific. Instead of prioritizing where boundaries around the field of reform might be -- as most conventional research tends to do -- my approach acknowledges that the discursive principles, operating in the field, overlap in what might appear to be boundaries between pre-reform and reform, traditional academic capital and curriculum theory capital, and technological capital and progressive capital. For instance, many reform ideas were used or discussed in Iceland prior to 1966 (the year when Skólarannsóknadeild was founded) in localized settings (Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1991a, chapter 5.2). Furthermore, earlier reforms (e.g., written tests) had become interwoven with other pre-reform traditions long before 1966 (Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1991a, chapter 3.1; see also Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1991c). The metaphor of a spectrum with two poles is meant to capture the fact that there are no "pure" reform ideas; rather, there is a polarization of such ideas in certain locations that can be pictured by investigating documents and debates.

In fact, the poles and the spectra are always a subject to change. The identification of three spectra is based on a research of the educational discourse in the period between 1966 and 1991. Nevertheless, the debates

have taken drastic changes, and, consequently, what did not have currency in the early 1980s may have currency now. Therefore, the poles that I have defined can not serve as the taxonomies that conventional research in education tends to search for. A pole is only meaningful as a category as long as the capital that the pole has been constructed of has any currency.

This perspective is grounded in the genealogical, relational approach to history which I briefly explained at the beginning of the paper. I focus on the continuities and ruptures, not essential differences. I focus on the historical and social processes of legitimation of discursive themes and practices. I focus on the epistemic relations between the individual and the discursive themes that are available. The genealogical, relational approach to history acknowledges that such "epistemic alliances" are field-specific as they are based on a specific logic derived from a historically and socially constructed legitimating principle.

From this perspective, struggles in the field of educational reform are seen as struggles for the currency of the discursive themes and practices that an epistemic individual wants to become counted as capital. This perspective is suited to search for ruptures that could be exploited. In fact, this study, which I conducted in 1990-91 for my dissertation, made me redirect my attention and redefine potential alliances. In short, I believe that arguing for the potential of a "progressive curriculum theory capital," based on, for instance, feminist pedagogy, as opposed to scientific curriculum theory capital, based on, for instance, developmental psychology, is a utilization of the rift between technological and progressive views. At the same time, the strategy of defining progressive curriculum theory capital exploits the notion that the pre-reform pedagogy and traditional academic capital are relatives that should be combatted with the contention that pedagogy, curriculum theory, and other educational sciences are indeed not less academic than the traditional academic disciplines. As argued elsewhere, this is only possible in an ambiguous social space (Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1991a, chapter 7.2; 1992k).

A NARRATIVE STORY OR A GRAND MODEL?

The conceptual framework, adopted in this research, presents itself as a narrative story. This study interprets an event -- educational reform in elementary education in Iceland, 1966-1991 -- through a particular theoretical lense. It interprets the event as the formation of a social field with its own legitimating principles. Therefore, it is a story on multiple levels: it is the study of the reform that in itself is a curious story, and it is also a particular interpretation of the Foucauldian genealogy and Bourdieu's conceptual framework. The research framework is not a technical method that can be adapted as a model for any research; to perform a Bourdieuean study the researcher has to adopt a way of seeing and adapt it for the case s/he wants to study.

This story is not a normative story in the sense that I do not pretend that I have found the universal truth about neither of these two levels that I just

identified. But it is normative in the sense that it takes ôvert and covert stances for one of the poles in all of the spectra that are discussed. It also takes the stance that a conceptual investigation is more important than a historicist study, that avoiding deterministic Marxism is vital to the development of Marxist thought, and that it is necessary to account for individuals, discourses, and structural relations in one framework.

The "model" that the study is based on -- or provides, if you wish -- is most directly related to research on educational reform. It combats the technological view, central to most reforms, that there is a simple solution to most problems. The world is complex, but approaches that focus on finding causes often satisfy the researcher if one or two causal relationships have been identified or a particular group (e.g., capitalists, teachers) can be made responsible. The search by reformers and others for simple causal relationships to explain the failure "rate" of the reform does not give us as sophisticated insights into the reform conjuncture as frameworks, such as Bourdieu's, that take the complexities and intersections into account and acknowledge that the world is often rather unpredictable. This is not to say that identifying "causes" or "solutions" is always or by definition wrong; rather, that the research that is discussed here does not give a priority to these tasks.

Therefore, this research framework does not offer as much of a grand model as the Bourdieuean conceptual framework may look like. It is a way of interpreting events but not a method to produce progress.

Endnotes

1) By "trajectory" I mean that the history of the reform is unique yet it does have a logic which can only partially be uncovered as it is only partially predictable. The term trajectory also refers to the fact that this line of inquiry is less concerned with predictions or providing guidance for immediate tasks than much other research in education is.

2) For Bourdieu, a social strategy is the product of practical sense for a particular social game (e.g, Bourdieu 1986b). In this view, strategies may be consciously (deliberately) planned but they are also the unconscious (non-socially conscious) adaptation to the infinitely varied, objectively orchestrated field whose trajectory is also structured by the strategies employed by individuals, groups, and institutions in the field.

3) The Icelandic social studies curriculum project is in part based on the American controversial project, **Man: A Course of Study** (see Educational Development Center 1968-76). The Icelandic project was under the leadership of dr. Wolfgang Edelstein of the Max Planck Institut in Berlin who was an advisor to the Ministry of Culture and Education from 1966 to 1984 (see, for instance, Edelstein 1987). The biology curriculum for the age level 13-16 (the highest grades of the elementary school) was a translation of the so-called blue version of **Molecules to Man** (see Biological Sciences Curriculum Study and Welch 1973). The Christian studies project is based on Norwegian textbooks. Most other projects do not have as direct prototypes as these three projects.

4) The identification of the discursive themes of the reform is based on an investigation and analysis of various types of sources. They include but are not limited to a draft of the general syllabus/curriculum framework for primary schools (**Adalnámskrá grunnskóla** 1983), the elementary school teachers' union (i.e., Kennarasamband Íslands) school policy (i.e., **Skólastefna** 1990), what was emphasized in teacher education institutions in Iceland around 1980 (among other sources, classnotes), conference proceedings, debates on crucial issues, interviews with teacher leaders and teacher educators, letters and correspondences, and unpublished materials, as well as secondary sources (Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1991a, chapter 4; 1991b).

5) Information on education and career of (biographical) individuals was gathered from **Kennaratal** (Ólafur Th. Kristjánsson 1958-65; Ólafur Th. Kristjánsson and Sigrún Hardardóttir 1985-8) with some entries as old as from 1979 or older and **Æviskrár samtídarmanna** (Torfi Jónsson 1982-4). In total, I studied the biographies of between three and four hundred individuals who at some point in time worked for any of six reform institutions that I studied (Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson 1991a, chapter 6).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Adalnámskrá grunnskóla. Almennur hluti. - Drög. [The general syllabus for elementary schools. General part. A draft]. 1983. Menntamálaráduneytid. [Ministry of Culture and Education]. [Reykjavík].

Baron, Steve, et al. 1981. **Unpopular Education. Schooling and Social Democracy in England since 1944**. Hutchinson, in association with the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham. London.

Biological Sciences Curriculum Study and Welch, Claude A. 1973. **Biological Science. Molecules to Man: Blue Version**. 3rd ed. Houghton Mifflin. Boston.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1975. "The Specificity of the Scientific Field and the Social Conditions of the Progress of Reason." Transl. by Richard Nice. **Social Science Information** 14, 6, 19-47.

___. 1984. **Distinction. A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste**. Transl. by Richard Nice. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, MA.

___. 1985. "Social Space and the Genesis of Groups." Transl. by Richard Nice. **Theory and Society** 14, 723-44.

___. 1986a. "The Forms of Capital." Transl. by Richard Nice. **Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education**. John G. Richardson (ed.). Greenwood Press. New York.

___. 1986b. "From Rules to Strategies." Interview with Pierre Lamaison. Transl. by Richard Hurley. **Cultural Anthropology** 1, 1, 110-20.

___. 1988. **Homo Academicus**. Transl. by Peter Collier. Stanford University Press. Stanford, CA.

___. 1989a. "Social Space and Symbolic Power." Transl. by Loïc J. D. Wacquant. **Sociological Theory** 7, 1, 14-25.

___. 1989b. "Toward a Reflexive Sociology. A Workshop with Pierre Bourdieu." Interview with and transl. by Loïc J. D. Wacquant. **Sociological Theory** 7, 1, 26-63.

___. 1989c. "The Corporation of the Universal: The Role of Intellectuals in the Modern World." Transl. by Carolyn Betensky. **Telos** 81, 99-110.

___. 1989d. "For a Socio-Analysis of Intellectuals: On Homo Academicus." Interview with and transl. by Loïc J. D. Wacquant. **Berkeley Journal of Sociology** 34, 1-29.

___. 1990. **The Logic of Practice**. Transl by Richard Nice. Stanford University Press. Stanford, CA. [Transl. of Bourdieu 1980].

Edelstein, Wolfgang. 1987. "The Rise and Fall of the Social Science Curriculum Project in Iceland, 1974-1984: Reflections on Reason and Power in Educational Progress." **Journal of Curriculum Studies** 19, 1, 1-23. [Often referred to as Edelstein 1986 because of a typo on page 1 in the journal].

Educational Development Center. Social Studies Curriculum Program. 1968-76. **Man: A Course of Study** (kit). Course director: Peter B. Dow. Consulting scholars: Jerome S. Bruner, Irven DeVore, Asen Balikci. Curriculum Development Associates. Washington, D.C.

Erla Kristjánsdóttir et al. 1989. **Álitamál í kennslu frá sjónarhorni fjögurra námsgreina**. [How to teach about matters of opinion - from the perspective of four subject matters]. Idunn. Reykjavík.

Foucault, Michel. 1971. "Orders of Discourse." Transl. by Rupert Swyer. **Social Science Information** 10, 2, 7-30.

___. 1972. **The Archaeology of Knowledge**. Transl. by A.M. Sheridan Smith. Harper & Row. New York.

___. 1977. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." **Language, Counter-Memory, Practice. Selected Essays and Interviews**. Donald F. Bouchard (ed.). Transl. by Bouchard and Sherry Simon. Cornell University Press. Ithaca, N.Y.

___. 1980. **Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977**. Colin Gordon (ed.). Transl. by Gordon, Leo Marshall, John Mepham, and Kate Soper. Pantheon. New York.

Ingólfur Á. Jóhannesson. 1991a. **The Formation of Educational Reform as a Social Field in Iceland and the Social Strategies of Educationists, 1966-1991**. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. UMI 9123842.

___. 1991b. "The Formation of Educational Reform as a Social Field in Iceland in the 1970s and 1980s: Legitimating Principles and the Social Strategies of Epistemic Individuals." Presentation at the American Educational Research Association conference. Chicago, Illinois. April 3-7. ERIC TM 016270

___. 1991c. "¿Por qué estudiar las reformas y los reformadores? La formación en la reforma educativa como campo social en Islandia, 1966-1991". [Why study reform and reformers? The formation of educational reform as a social field in Iceland ...]. **Revista de educacion** 296, 99-135.

___. 1992a. "Legitimationsprobleme: Die isländische Erziehungsreform 1966-1991." **Nordeuropa Forum** 2, 1, 25-8.

___. 1992c. "Kennarafræði sem kapítal. Af vettvangi íslenskra menntaumbóta." [Teacher studies as capital. On the social field of educational reform in Iceland]. To appear in a book published to celebrate the 70th birthday of Jónas Pálsson, Rector of the College of Education, 1983-1991. [In progress].

___. 1992d. "Legitimating Principles and Epistemic Individuals in the Social Field of Educational Reform in Iceland, 1966-1991." [A paper in progress].

___. 1992k. "Professionalization of Progress and Expertise among Teacher Educators in Iceland." Presentation at the American Educational Research Association conference. San Francisco, California. April 20-24.

Jónas Pálsson. 1978. "Kennarinn er undirstada umbóta ..." [The teacher is

the base for reform ...]. **Hödur** 1, 1, 14-17.

Kennaraháskóli Íslands. 1986. "Greinargerd um Kennaraháskóla Íslands." [Report on the College of Education]. **Kennaramenntun á krossgötum?** [Teacher education at crossroads?] Ólafur H. Jóhannsson (ed.). Conference on teacher education. Borgartún 6. Reykjavík. April 25-26. Xerox, 57-63.

Kennsluskrá fyrir almennt kennaranám. 120 einingar. Skólaárid 1991-1992. [Syllabus for the general teacher education program. 120 credit units]. 1991. Kennaraháskóli Íslands. [Reykjavík].

Lather, Patti. 1991. **Getting Smart. Feminist Research and Pedagogy With/in the Postmodern**. Routledge. New York.

Luke, Carmen. 1989. **Pedagogy, Printing, and Protestantism. The Discourse on Childhood**. State University of New York Press. Albany.

Námskrá fyrir almennt kennaranám. [Curriculum for the general teacher education program]. 1991. Kennaraháskóli Íslands. [Reykjavík].

Noujain, Elie Georges. 1987. "History as Genealogy: An Exploration of Foucault's Approach to History." **Contemporary French Philosophy**. A. Phillips Griffith (ed.). Cambridge University Press. New York, 157-74.

Ólafur Th. Kristjánsson. 1958-65. **Kennaratal á Íslandi I-II**. [Who's who in education?]. Oddi. Reykjavík.

Ólafur Th. Kristjánsson and Sigrún Hardardóttir. 1985-8. **Kennaratal á Islandi III-V**. [Who's who in education?]. Oddi. Reykjavík.

Ólafur J. Proppé, Sigurjón Mýrdal, and Bjarni Daníelsson. [In progress]. "The Management of Change: A Study of Regulation and Agency in Icelandic Teacher Education." To appear in **Teacher Education Reforms: A Seven Country Study of Changing Patterns of Regulations**. Thomas S. Popkewitz (ed.). Forthcoming from State University of New York Press.

Popkewitz, Thomas S. 1991. **A Political Sociology of Educational Reform: Power/Knowledge in Teaching, Teacher Education, and Research**. Teachers College Press. New York.

Skólastefna. 1990. [School policy]. 3rd ed. Kennarasamband Íslands. [Reykjavík]. [Full title is **Skólastefna Kennarasambands Íslands. Mennt er máttur**].

Torfi Jonsson. 1982-4. **Æviskrár samtídarmanna I-III**. [Contemporary biographical excerpts]. Skuggsjá. [Hafnarfjördur].

Thorsteinn Gunnarsson. 1990. **Controlling Curriculum Knowledge: A Documentary Study of the Icelandic Social Science Curriculum Project (SSCP) 1974-1984**. A Dissertation Presented to the Faculty of the College of Education. Ohio University. [Athens].